Crimean Scholars and the Kadizadeli Tradition in the 18th Century

*Mykhaylo M. Yakubovych**

18. Asırda Kırımlı Âlimler ve Kadızadeli Geleneği

Öz ■ Kadızadelilik Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda görülen en ilginç dini hareketlerden birisidir. 17. yüzyılı, bu hareketin sonraki gelişimini de biçimlendiren bir oluşum devresi olarak gören bir çok araştırmacı, çalışmalarını çoğunlukla bu hareketin erken tarihçesine odaklamışlardır. Bu çalışmada, yazar, Kırım'da temsilini bulan ve Osmanlı entellektüel çevrelerine yakinen bağlı olan son dönem Kadızadeli geleneklerinden birini ele almaktadır. Araştırma, bölgedeki Kadızadeli ilmî birikiminin anahatlarını, -Muhammed el-Kefevî (ö. 1754), Muhammed el-Akkirmanî (ö. 1761) ve Kutbüddîn el-Kırımî (ö. 1800?) isimlerinin mirasları da dahil olmak üzere-, göstermektedir. Araştırmadaki temel argüman Kadızadeliler'in 'doğru Sünnet'i yeniden tesis etme iddialarının geleneksel Sünnî teoloji ve ahlakının yeniden yorumlanması anlamına da geldiğidir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Post-Klasik İslam, Kadızadelilik, Kırım Hanlığı, İslam'da reform, İbn-i Sina sonrası dinbilim/teoloji, Tek tanrıcılık öğretisi, Özgür irade

Introduction

When approaching the "intellectual history" (the most popular term for many contemporary studies on post-Classical Islam) of the Crimea, many scholars traditionally relate it to the kalam and Sufism, as in the case with the Late

* The National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine. This research would not have been possible without the funding from the Willis M. Doney Membership Fund during my stay at the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton, NJ, USA) as a member in 2014.

Ottoman religious thought in general. Despite the existence of some in-depth research on this tradition, represented by case studies on Crimean scholars,[1] in general it requires a more complex approach. The following question must be answered: Did a specifically "Crimean" intellectual tradition really exist or should the intellectual history of Crimea be interpreted only in a broader context, meaning that of the Golden Horde or the Ottoman one? On the one hand, most of Crimean scholars in the Khanate period (1441 - 1783) were students or teachers of authorities from other parts of the Empire, primarily, Istanbul and Anatolia. On the other hand, Crimean Peninsula was a center of Islamic learning since the first half of 14th century. Numerous medreses like *Zincirli Medrese* (founded in 1500) were not only purely "religious" since the "rational" sciences were also taught (*kalām*, *manṭiq*, etc.) in these institutions. By examining certain *isnads* and *silsilahs* of scholars from this part of the Islamic world one may easily find strong links between generations of the Crimean scholars who started their career in Ottoman Kaffa, Bahchisaray or the cities of Bujak (Akkerman). Still, the final destination in career paths of the most of these scholars were Istanbul or other central Ottoman cities.[2]

While speaking about the intellectual legacy of the Crimean scholars, the prevalence of an Ottoman connection is much more evident, namely, the Kadizadeli movement, founded upon the works and intellectual endeavors of Mehmed Birgivi (d. 1574) and Mehmed Kadizade (d. 1635). The Kadizadeli movement has been subject of many studies primarily due to its ideological and social dimensions.[3] Recent studies show the presence of Kadizadeli followers in the

1 See, for example, Gudrun Schubert, "Ahmad b. Abdallah al-Qirimi, ein Verteidiger Ibn al-Arabis gegen die Orthodoxie", *Asiatische Studien*, 48 (1994), pp. 1379-1381; Ashirbek Muminov, "Manuscripts of "Kata'ib A'lam al-Akhyar", New Materials for the Biography and Activity of Mahmud ibn Sulayman al-Kafawi", *Written Monuments of the Orient*, 2/19 (2013), pp. 159-177; Necmettin Pehlivan, "Muhammed Kefevî ve "Risâle fî'l- Âdâb"ı", *Felsefe Dünyası*, 56 (2012), pp. 322-333.

2 This is evident from a quick look at the biogaphies given by Mehmed Tahir Bursalı: Mehmed Tahir Bursalı, *Osmanlılar Zamanında Yetişen Kırım Mü'ellifleri* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1980).

3 Madeline Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* vol. 45/4, (1986), pp. 251-269; Marinos Sariyannis, "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a 'Mercantile Ethic'?", *Political Initiatives "From the Bottom Up" in the Ottoman Empire*, (Rhetymmo: Crete University Press, 2012), pp. 263-291; Kerima Filan, "Religious Puritans in Sarajevo in the 18th Century," *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulamaları Merkezi Dergisi*, 33 (2013), pp. 43-62; John Curry,

regions of the Empire which are far from the center. For example, although it has been argued previously that Kadizadelism had already lost its influence in 18th century,[4] recent research on Bosnia and other regions shows quite another picture.[5] Moreover, when talking about the theoretical side of the Kadizadeli movement, it must be noted that some of the most advanced and well accepted commentaries on Birgivi's *al-Tarīqah al-Muḥammadiyah* were written in this period (like *Al-Barīqah Sharḥ al-Tarīqah* by Abu Sa'īd al-Khādimī, d. 1763) and its aftermath.[6]

Despite the lack of any special self-identification (Kadizadelis did not care about their self-definition) as a special school of thought in the Ottoman Sunni Islam, their ideology has been mostly reduced to the critics of the practical Sufism. At the level of theoretical discourse (theology), Kadizadelis appealed to the same sources of Ashʿarism and Maturidi kalam and, of course, were engaged in the post-Classical philosophical discussions. For example, one of the most informative sources with a strict Kadizadeli background, *Majālis al-Abrār* by Aḥmad bin ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Rūmī (d. 1633) provides discussion of certain metaphysical issues.[7] Kadizadeli scholars generally used the same 'canonical' works as did other contemporaneous Ottoman authors - works of Abu al-Barakāt al-Nasafī, Athīr al-Dīn al-Abharī, Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī and others. The central marker of Kadizadelism was, of course, rejection of certain Sufi practices. For example, it was reported that they protested Sufi *dhikr* practice after *ṣalāt al-'aṣr*, since no additional prayer was recorded in the Sunnah for that. Kadizadelism also can be viewed as a social movement. It is known, for example, that many political leaders were closely connected with the Kadizadeli circles. This can be observed, for example, in the biographies

"Kadizadeli Ottoman Scholarship, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, and the Rise of the Saudi State," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 26/3 (2015), pp. 265-288; Sheikh, Mustapha, "Taymiyyan Influences in an Ottoman-Ḥanafī Milieu: The Case of Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Āqḥiṣārī," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 25/01 (2015), pp. 1-20; Simeon Evstatiev, "Qāḍīzādeli Movement and the Revival of Takfīr in the Ottoman Age," *Accusations of Unbelief in Islam A Diachronic Perspective on Takfīr*, ed. by Camilla Adang, Hassan Ansari, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 213-244.

4 Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," p. 268.

5 See Filan, "Religious Puritans."

6 Abu Sa'īd Al-Khādimī, *Al-Barīqah Sharḥ al-Ṭarīqah*, (Istanbul: Hakikat Kitabevi, 2011).

7 Aḥmad Al-Rūmī, *Majālis al-Abrār wa Masālik al-Akhyār wa Maḥaīq al-Bida'ah wa Maqāmi' al-Ashrār* (Madinah: Jāmiah al-Islāmiyah, 2007), pp. 148-160.

of Abaza Hasan Paşa (d. 1659), Köprülü Mehmed Pasha (d. 1661) and Fazıl Ahmed Paşa (d. 1676).[8]

When talking about the first appearance of the Kadizadeli scholarship in Crimea and other parts of Southern Ukraine, incorporated to the Ottoman Empire in 17th and 18th centuries, one of the most important pieces of evidence are certain manuscripts preserved. First, one can mention the manuscript copy of the abovementioned book of Aḥmad al-Rūmī *Majālis al-Abrār wa Masālik al-Akhyār wa Maḥaīq al-Bidaʿah wa Maqāmiʾ al-Ashrār* ("Gatherings of the Righteous, Way of the Better Ones, Destruction of Innovations and Battles against the Evil Ones") from Zincirli Medrese, currently preserved in Lviv Museum of the History of Religions (Lviv, Ukraine).[9] The manuscript generally corresponds to the aforementioned critical edition by ʿAlī Fūrā. Divided into one hundred chapters, this book contains the typical Kadizadeli discourse against innovations pertaining to visiting graveyards, and performing additional prayers (*nawāfil*), etc. The manuscript from Zincirli Medrese was rewritten by some Crimean scribe ʿAbd al-Gaffār bin Bahadirshāh in 1216 hijri (1801 C. E.) from the earliest source. Also, it contains some glosses on the margins (which could be classified as *ḥāshiyah* or *taʿlīq*), providing explanations, signed by some *qāḍī.* It looks like a local reception of this work, which has been read by few generations of scholars in the library of Zincirli Medrese until its closure in the 20s of the last century.

Muḥammad al-Kafawī and his Reception of Al-Birkawī

One of the most prolific Crimean authors of the 18th century was Muḥammad bin al-Ḥājjī Ḥamīd al-Kafawī (d. 1754/1755), a scholar from Kaffa who contributed to the fields of Islamic theology, law, rhetoric, tafsir and several others.[10] Despite the fact that dozens of his works are known (some of them were published early like his *Ḥāshiyah* on al-Lārī's commentary to Athīr al-Dīn al-Abharī's *Hidāyat al-Ḥikma*)[11], little is known about his life. It seems that he was born in a noble family in Ottoman Kaffa between 1690 and 1710; his father

8 Sariyannis, "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon."

9 Aḥmad Al-Rūmī, *Majālis al-Abrār wa Masālik al-Akhyār wa Maḥaīq al-Bidaʾah wa Maqāmiʾ al-Ashrār*. Lviv Museum of the History of Religion, No. 6494, 302 ff.

10 It seems that the only published study on this scholar is the next one: Pehlivan, "Muhammed Kefevî ve "Risâle fi'l- Âdâb"ı".

11 Muḥammad Al-Kafawī, *Ḥāshiyah ʿalā al-Lārī* (Istanbul: Maṭbaʿa Sulṭāna, 1867).

was a descendant of the Prophet (*seyyid*) and made *ḥājj* to Makkah. Later career of Muḥammad al-Kafawī led him to Madinah and, finally, to Jerusalem where he became a judge.[12] Unfortunately, almost none of his works contains any biographical details. However, from his wide knowledge of the religious and rational sciences it may be concluded that he received a very good education, probably in Istanbul or some other Ottoman center of learning.

Mehmed Bursali, well-known biographer of the late Ottoman scholars, states that Muḥammad al-Kafawī authored more than 13 works. In fact, it is more than 20, and it looks like some of his works are lost or not yet catalogued. Most of his contribution, as it was typical for the post-Classical Islamic learning, were *ḥāshiyās* and *sharḥs*, but there are also few original works such as *Risālah fī Ithbāt al-Wājib*.[13]

For our purposes here, the most interesting work of Muḥammad al-Kafawī is his *Sharḥ kalimāt al-Lā'iayh,* written as a commentary on Muḥammad al-Birkawī's treatise. The title of this short commentary (consisting of only two folios), which is preserved in Princeton University Library under the title *Sharḥ kalimāt al-Lāgaziayh*, [14] seems to be related to the Arabic particle *lā* ("no") which is used in *shahādah* "there is no god but Allah". The main question author examines is how to understand this negation, i.e. whether it means the rejection of individuation (*ta'yīn*) or not. Interpreting al-Birkawī, he proposes five "answers"; interestingly, in some of these answers Sufism is blamed and a certain conception of "*pure tawḥīd*" is stated. This approach in Sunnism makes Kadizadelism quite close to the positions of later Wahhabism, as J. Curry notes.[15]

The first three answers could be described as follows. First of all, this negation (*lā ilāha*) means the rejection of the divinity from everything what is not God. Secondly, this is the rejection of a certain type of "individuation" like false deities and so on. And third answer says that this is the rejection of the existence of everything beside God, since only God is the real true being.[16]

12 Mehmed Tahir Bursalı, *Osmanli Müellifleri* (İstanbul: Meral Yayınevi, 1975), pp. 380-381.

13 Muḥammad Al-Kafawī, *Risālah fī Ithbāt al-Wājib*, Princeton University Library, Robert Garrett Collection, ELS 3409, ff. 1-3.

14 Muḥammad Al-Kafawī, *Sharḥ kalimāt lāgaziyah li-l-Birkawī*, Princeton University Library, Robert Garrett Collection. 4212Y, ff.42b-43a.

15 Curry, "Kadizadeli Ottoman Scholarship, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, and the Rise of the Saudi State," pp. 186-188.

16 Al-Kafawī, Muḥammad, *Sharḥ kalimāt lāgaziyah li-l-Birkawī*, f. 42 b.

Muḥammad al-Kafawī emphasizes that the only correct "answer" is the first one, because *ilāh* is not something individuated (since false deities does not exist at all), as the second answer say. Third answer also looks completely untrue, because according to Muḥammad al-Kafawī this is the position of some *wujūdiyah* and *falāsifah*: "the thoughts are the most harmful… they are beliefs of *wujūdiyah* and *falāsifah*, cursed by God, angels and humans." It looks like he criticizes followers of the idea of the "unity of being" (*waḥdah al-wujūd*), associated with the theoretical Sufism of the school of Ibn ʻArabi. Ibn ʻArabi's influence was particularly strong in Halveti Sufism, the main object of Kadızadeli criticism.[17]

Other traces of the Kadizadeli position can be observed in his interpretation of the other part of the *shahādah*, *illā Llah*. Among more than six answers he selects one, speaking about the establishment of the necessary being of God. However, he says, the problem is that human beings may ascribe divinity (*ulūhiyah*) to things other than God, using the individuation of what is meant under the word "Allah". Interestingly, Muḥammad al-Kafawī mentions the fact that this position corresponds to the view of ʻUbayd Allah al-Bukhārī (d. 1346) in his *al-Tawḍīḥ fī Ḥāl Gawāmiḍ al-Tanqīḥ*. In his discussion of this issue, ʻUbayd Allah al-Bukhārī reveals the difference between polytheistic "association" (*shirk*) of something with God while recognizing Him and the true Islamic belief in the Oneness of God.[18] So, Muḥammad al-Kafawī's position could be explained as the vision of the "real believers" as only those who recognize unique "divinity" (*ulūhiyah*) of God and nothing else.

Taking this into consideration, it may be argued that Muḥammad al-Kafawī chose a position which is very close to the basic doctrine of Muḥammad al-Sanʻānī (d. 1768) and Muḥammad bin ʻAbd al-Wahhāb (d. 1791). Essence of this idea is the definition of the real belief in the Oneness of God as the faith in His Dominion (*rubūbiyah*) and divinity (*ulūhiyah*).[19] However, just like other

17 John Curry, *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire. The Rise of the Halveti Order, 1350-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 17.

18 This work is still unpublished, the same position may be found, for example, in his *Sharḥ Al-Talwīḥ*: ʻUbaid Allah Al-Maḥbūbī, *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥ ʻalā al-Tawḍīḥ li-Matni al-Tanqīḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, ed. by Zakariyah ʻAmirat (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-ʻIlmiyah, 1416/1996), II, p. 64.

19 Muḥammad al-Sanʻānī, *Taṭhīr al-ʻItiqād ʻan Adrān al-Ilḥad*, ed. by Naṣir bin Hasan, (Makkah: Al-Waḥīd, 1425/2009); Muḥammad bin ʻAbd al-Wahhāb, Al-Jāmi' li-ʻIbādah Lillahi Waḥdahi, *Silsilah Sharḥ al-Rasa'īl*, (Cairo: Dār al-Furqān, 1424/2008), pp. 245-279.

Kadizadelis, Muḥammad al-Kafawī used traditional *kalām* sources for his interpretation.

Other works of Muḥammad al-Kafawī follow the same pattern. The foremost example that comes to mind is *Risālah fī Ithbāt al-Wājib* ("Treatise on the Establishment of the Necessary"), also preserved in Princeton University library.[20] It must be also noted that despite his remoteness from his homeland, some of Muḥammad al-Kafawī's works were known in the lands very close to the Crimea like Bujak. For example, one of his *ḥāshiyah*s on *Risālah fī Adāb al-Baḥth*, dated 1180/1766, was copied on the "banks of Tūna river", meaning Danube.[21] Further research on this personality could reveal new information about his influence over 18th century Ottoman philosophy and, of course, about the propagation of Kadizadelism.

Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī: Kadizadeli Theologian?

In contrast to Muḥammad al-Kafawī, his younger contemporary Muḥammad bin Muṣṭafā al-Aqkirmānī (d. 1761) is much better known. A few studies on his works have already appeared.[22] After his birth and early years in Akkerman (currently Bilhorod-Dnistrovs'kyi, Odessa region, Ukraine), he continued his education and career in Istanbul, Izmir and Egypt; his last service was the position of Hanafi judge in Makkah. Students of Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī received some positions in Yedisan, steppe area between the rivers of Dnister (*Turla*) and Pivdenny Buh (*Aksu*),[23] so he preserved ties with the local elites in his homeland. Apparently, the legacy of Muḥammad al-Aqkirmāni was known

20 Muḥammad Al-Kafawī, *Risālah fi Ithbāt al-Wājib*. Princeton University Library. Robert Garrett Collection, no. ELS 3409, ff. 1a-3b.

21 Muḥammad Al-Kafawī, *Ḥāshiyah ʿalā sharḥ Adab al-Baḥth*, Vernads'ky National Library of Ukraine, Manuscripts division, 74 no. 49.

22 Sayın Dalkıran, "Akkirmânî'nin İrâde-i Cüziyye ile İlgili Risâlesi ve Değerlendirmesi", *EKEV Akademi Dergisi-Sosyal Bilimler*, 1/2 (1998), pp. 173-180; Neslihan Dağ, "Muhammed B. Mustafa Akkirmani'nin İklilü't-Teracim Adlı Eserinde Felsefi Kavramlar", (yüksek lisans tezi) Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyak Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2006, p. 15-21; H. Toksöz, "Muhammed Akkirmânî'nin Ta'rîfâtü'l-fünûn ve menâkıbü'l-musannifîn Adlı Eserinde Felsefî İlimler Algısı", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* [*Osmanlı Eğitim ve Düşünce Dünyası,* guest editor: Seyfi Kenan], 42 (2013), pp. 177-205.

23 Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, "Crimean Tatar and Nogay Scholars of the 18th Century", ed. by. M. Kemper; A. von Kügelgen; D. Yermakov, *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1996), p. 279-296.

in Crimea as well, since one of his main theological treatises, *'Iqd al-Qalā'īd fī Sharḥ al-'Aqā'īd* was copied in Crimea by two local scholars Wālī al-Dīn ibn 'Abid and Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Ganī directly from the author's original at the end of the 18th century.[24]

Among the most popular works, written by Muḥammad al-Aqkirmāni, commentary on *Forthy Hadith* of Birgivi should be noted. This *Sharḥ*, preserved in numerous copies, has its early printed edition.[25] In his foreword Muḥammad al-Aqkirmāni states the necessity to follow Sunnah against many evil practices: "in our times, ignorance has become widespread and knowledge has become like it were nothing; [people] have taken innovations and prohibited things as the best way to be close to God… People with a weak mind have appeared to urge people in practices in which innovations have been converted into a kind of worship".[26] The same rhetoric can be readily found in other sections of the commentary.

In some of the theological works written by Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī, he makes clear distinction between the idea of dominion (*rubūbiyah*) of God and recognition of God as the only object of worship *('ubūdiyah*). In his *Sharḥ takhmīs Al-Dimyaṭiyah* where he explains poetical verses of Shams al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭī (d. 1727), dedicated to the meanings of the Beautiful Names of God (*al-asmā' al-ḥusnā*). One of the copies of this *Sharḥ* is preserved in Princeton University Library.

Providing some interpretation for the names of God, Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī writes: "Words *Yā Rabb* is not only a sign of belief, but also such an important pillar of faith as the establishment of Divine Domination (*rubūbiyah*)". For Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī, belief in *rubūbiyah* should be followed by recognition that "God alone gives mercy and blessings", so this perspective makes his view close to the Kadizadeli statements. In another work, *Risālah fi Bismillah*, he explains that essence of God is defined as the only object for *'ubūdiyah*.[27]

However, the most clear influence of Kadizadeli tradition on Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī can be observed in his ethical teachings, for example, in his treatise

---

24 Muḥammad Al-Aqkirmāni, *'Iqd al-Qalā'īd fī Sharḥ al-'Aqā'īd,* Princeton University Library, Robert Garrett Collection, No. 4214 Y, 216 f.

25 Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī, *Sharḥ aḥādīth al-'Arba'īn*, (Istanbul: Aqdām Maṭba'ī, 1905).

26 al-Aqkirmānī, *Sharḥ aḥādīth al-'Arba'īn*., p. 6.

27 Muḥammad Al-Aqkirmāni, *Risālah fi al-bismillah*, Princeton University Library, Robert Garrett Collection, No. 832Y, ff. 376-384

İrāde-i Juziyye Risalesi, which has been preserved in numerous copies. This small text with relevant introduction is published by Sayın Dalkıran.[28]

The main idea that is expounded by Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī in this treatise is *irādah al-juz'iyyah,* "particular will". This term, as Philip Bruckmayr argues, was developed by Mehmed Birgivi to find some middle position between the Maturidi and Ash'ari interpretation of the problem of the individual freedom and Divine will.[29] Other scholars like Angelika Brodersen draw parallels between the idea of the "particular will" and dominion of the individual reason over will in Thomas Aquinas, stating that this position is among the most moderate positions in Islamic thought.[30] It is possible to trace the origins of this idea back to Abu Manṣūr al-Māturīdī, who described free choice of human being as the freedom to perform an action or not, since if God knows that human will not do such thing He is not going to create it.[31] Abu al-Thanā' al-Lāmishī (d. 1144), one of the leading Maturidi authorities even said that freedom of choice is the "logical" fact which is understood by every(one who has) sound intuition (*badīhatu al-'aql*)".[32] Interestingly, this idea has been also developed by some pre-Wahhabi traditionalists like Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī (d. 1750), who was a teacher of the aforementioned Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb and Muhammad al-San'ānī. In his *Al-Ifāḍatu al-Madaniyah fi al-Irādah al-Juz'iyah* ("Medinan Proclamation on the Particular Will") he clearly states that "creation of the action by God does not mean that servant of God must perform it, since the action is created only after the will of the servant of God and his resoluteness in this will".[33]

---

28 Dalkıran, "Akkirmânî'nin İrâde-i Cüziyye ile İlgili Risâlesi ve Değerlendirmesi," pp. 173-180.

29 Philip Bruckmayr, "The Particular Will (*al-irādat al-juz'iyya*): Excavations Regarding a Latecomer in Kalām Terminology on Human Agency and its Position in Naqshbandi Discourse," *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, 13 (2011), pp. 2-19. Moreover, Philip Bruckmayr compares the doctrine of the "particular will" with the Protestant ethics, emphasizing the rationalization of this issue as one of the factors for the Turkish reform and economical success.

30 Angelika Brodersen, "Göttliches und menschliches Handeln im māturīditischen kalām", *Jahrbuch für Islamische Theologie und Religionspädagogik*," 2 (2013), pp. 117-139.

31 See: J. Meric Pessano, "Irāda, Ikhtiyār, Qudra, Kasb the View of Abū Manṣur al-Māturīdī," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, no. 104 (1984), p. 183.

32 Abu al-Thāna' Al-Lāmishī, *Al-Tamhīd ila Qawā'id al-Tawḥid*, ed. by A. Turkī, (Beirut: Dār al-Garb al-Islāmī, 1995), 260 p.

33 Muḥammad al-Sindī, *Al-Ifāḍatu al-Madaniyah fi al-Irādah al-Juz'iyyah*, (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 2002), p. 179.

Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī takes the same position. He tries to argue that "particular will" is the transformation of the "ability" (*qudrah*) into the "action" (*fi'l*) and guarantes the freedom of choice. When the question about the ontological status of this particular will appears (if it is a thing, *shay'*, it also must be created by God), Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī considers it as *ḥāl*, i.e. "state". Since the action is the final result of the human intention, it makes the individual responsible for the consequences. In his commentary to the well-known *ḥadīth* "every action is evaluated by intention", Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī analyzes the very structure of intention itself, describing certain stages in it. He also says that the final *ikhtiyār* ("choice") is a rational thing, since it is based on some "image of the action" (*taṣawwur*), opening or closing the way for intentional performance.[34] This individual centered vision of the freedom of choice could be stated as a basis for "mercantile ethics" with its "intellectual motivation" and "pragmatism", as the Kadizadeli approach has been qualified in a study by Marinos Sariyannis.[35]

Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī and the Kadizadeli Lamentation on the Fall of the Khanate

In 1783, after the ultimate fall of Crimea into the hands of Russian Empire, a new historical stage began in the peninsula. Islamic tradition of learning, despite some degree of flourishing at the end of 19th century (thanks to the efforts of İsmail Gaspıralı and other thinkers), went into stagnation, since religious life of the Crimean Tatars became controlled by new authorities. Many scholars left Crimea for the Ottoman Empire. One of them was a certain Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī. Nothing substantial is written about this scholar in the biographical literature. The only source which provides a minimal amount of information is a small treatise entitled *Rāḥah al-Ummah fī Dār al-Mu'minah* ("Comfort of the Community in the Abode of Believing Woman"), preserved in Milli Kütüphane (Ankara).[36] The manuscript was written in 1204 A.H. (1789 C. E.) and seems to be an autograph. It also contains some information about the previous holders such as *Çelebi Lutf Allah Efendi* who left it to his kids and a certain *Muftī Aḥmad Najīb*. The latter wrote a small note on the first folio of the manuscript, praying

---

34 al-Aqkirmānī, *Sharḥ Aḥādīth al-'Arba'īn*, p. 8.

35 Sariyannis, "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon," pp. 263-291.

36 Quṭb al-Dīn Al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fī Dār al-Mū'minah,* Milli Kütüphane (Ankara), no. 3577/1, ff. 1a-13b.

for its author to benefit from the "good tidings and the highest ranks for the patient believing man and women, who suffer from trials and temptations."[37]

The author starts his introduction to the manuscript by mentioning his name and explains his reasons to write the work. He states that some "Cossacks" (*qūsaq*) caused him to make *hijrah* from the Crimean lands to the "adobe which is very close", probably meaning Istanbul.[38] His rhetoric is generally pessimistic, as can be seen in his explanation of the loss of the homeland through the moral degradation of people. The main aim of the treatise is to reveal the "real meaning" of the Qur'anic verse "Corruption has appeared throughout the land and sea by [reason of] what the hands of people have earned so He may let them taste part of [the consequence of] what they have done that perhaps they will return [to righteousness]".[39] Among the sources on which his interpretations are based on he mentions the classical Islamic exegetical canon (works by al-Tabarī, al-Samarqandī, al-Bayḍawī, al-Rāzī and others) and, of course, its Ottoman counterparts like *tafsirs* of Abu Su'ūd and Isma'īl Ḥaqqi. Interestingly, he also pays attention to the aforementioned Kadizadeli work *Majālis al-Abrār*,[40] which was well-known in Crimea.

In general, he criticized his contemporaries for doing adultery and drinking wine, saying that this moral sins are the main reason why God put his homeland to the hands of unbelievers. Another reason is "unjust rulers", who practice *siyāsāt* (*punishments*) transgressing the measures of the Sharia. He also adds that people of his time distort the religion in such a way that "they are concerned only with the visitations of the holy places (*tazawwirāt*) and making prayers before them (*ṭalbiyāt*)".[41] From this statement it may be concluded that Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, like his Kadizadeli forerunners, blames popular Sufi practices of the veneration of *avliyā'*.

Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī reinterprets the question of "just rule", however, not merely in a moral way, but he also derives a social benefit from it: the main aim

37 Quṭb al-Dīn Al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fi Dār al-Mū'minah*, ff. 1b.

38 Quṭb al-Dīn Al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fi Dār al-Mū'minah,* f. 2a.

39 *The Qur'an*, 30:41. Translation by Sahih International Team (Birmingham: Maktabah Booksellers and Publishers, 2010).

40 He mentions it among the sources of aḥādīth. See: Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fi Dār al-Mū'minah*, f. 2a.

41 Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fi Dār al-Mū'minah*, f. 2a.

of the rulers is to develop “the order” (*niẓām*) in the country.[42] Furthermore, not only rulers are responsible for the fighting with *munkar* (“evil”), but so is every believer. Keeping this in mind, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī illustrates “weak morals of the society” by the Qur’anic example of the nation of Thamūd and their prophet Sāliḥ (The Qur’an, 7:71-78).

For Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, religion is the “ship of the salvation”, which is the only hope for the believing sinners. Muslim society, in his view, is the society of “believing sinners”, so the true believers are *gurabā*’, “strangers”. He even compares these “true believers” with the Muslims of the Prophet’s time in Mekkah, who were not able to practice all signs of Islam (*sh’ā’īr al-Islām*).[43] Usage of this notion for the apprehension of history reminds some Hanbali conceptions, used by certain authorities such as Ibn Rajab (d. 1393)[44]. These statements may be also described as some kind of positive approach to social ethics; according to Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, society must revive the primary meaning of the Islamic tradition and the responsibility for this falls not only on the rulers, but also on the individuals. This idea follows the same paradigm with the previous statements of Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī and other Kadizadeli scholars, who attempted at a reconsideration of the mass religiosity and its moral dimensions in the Ottoman society.

Conclusion

In contrast to many other “reformist traditions” like Uṣulism in the Shia tradition, or Sanusism and Wahhabism in Sunni Islam, Kadizadelism could be hardly framed as a continuing tradition. It is really difficult to follow the clear chronological lines of knowledge transmissions (*isnad, pl. asānid*) in Kadizadelism as one observes in the cases of Waḥid Bihbihāni (d. 1791) and Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 1791). Instead, we have different scholarly traditions, some associated with Mehmed Birgivi and his late follower Mehmed Kadizade. For example, Sufi ‘Abd al-Gānī an-Nābulusī (d. 1731) wrote a commentary to Birgivi’s *Al-Tarīqah al-Muḥammadiyah*, but his views are far from any typical Kadizadeli

42 Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fī Dār al-Mū’minah*, f. 7a

43 Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī, *Rāḥah al-Ummah fī Dār al-Mū’minah*, f. 13b.

44 Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, *Kashf al-Kurbah fi Wasf Ḥāl Ahl al-Gurba*, in *Majmū’ Rasā’il ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī*. ed. by A. Al-Ḥalawānī, (Cairo: Dār al-Fārūq al-Ḥāditha, 2003), pp. 315-332.

positions.[45] On the other hand, many scholars (including the addressed Crimean ones) were not directly connected to Mehmed Kadizade himself or his close circle, but the influence of these on the works of these scholars is quite obvious. Thus, Kadizadelism was not a kind of formalized "single entity" or a kind of "school", but rather a movement which set certain intellectual trends in motion. From this perspective, studying regional traditions of the Kadizadeli movement (Anatolian, Bosnian, Crimean, Syrian ones, etc.) turns out to be a promising venue to evaluate this intellectual phenomena. Development of the Kadizadelism and its social role in 18th century, i.e. "The Age of Islamic Reform", needs further attention.[46]

Kadizadelism became also the integral part of the post-classical Islamic philosophy on the northern shores of the Black Sea. Three Crimean scholars (Muḥammad al-Kafawī, Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī), who were active in this period, followed the Kadizadeli paradigm in apprehension of the critical religious challenges of their time. While Muḥammad al-Kafawī used the legacy of Mehmed Birgivi to renew the primary meaning of the Islamic doctrine of monotheism, Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī developed a critical vision of ethical consciousness and, respectively, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī advocated the responsibility of believers in building a moral society. All three scholars, despite their quite different career paths, were clearly disassociated from the Sufi tradition, in contrast to many earlier Crimean authors were somehow associated with Sufi brotherhoods such as the Naqshbandiyye, Halvetiyye, Qadiriyye and others. The most important call, conveyed by the Crimean scholars to their readers, is a reconsideration of individual religiosity. Notwithstanding the fact that anyone of the three scholars went beyond the measure of the traditional post-Classical approach to the Islamic theology (typical Maturidi and Hanafi works), all of them were quite critical about the religious learning and the state of religiosity in their times. Their pessimism was not a kind of moral rigorism, which can be seen in almost every religious tradition since its foundation, but a quite detailed idea of reform which appeared in relation to the crisis of religious authority in the late period of the post-Classical Islam (18th and 19th centuries). Further studies on the Kadizadeli revivalism and its development in various parts of the Ottoman domains should cover not only the history of this movement *per se*, but its later influence on the Islamic learning and reform in modernity.

45 See: Al-Nāblūsī, ʻAbd al-Gānī, *Al-Hadīqah al-Nadiyah*, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʻIlmiyah, 2011).

46 Zackery Heern, *The Emergence of Modern Shi'ism: Islamic Reform in Iraq and Iran* (London: Oneworld Publications, 2015), pp. 5-8.

Crimean Scholars and the Kadizadeli tradition in 18th Century

Abstract ■ Kadizadelism is one of the most interesting religious movements in the Ottoman Empire. Researchers have mostly focused their studies on its early history, considering 17th century as the formative period with the subsequent florescence. In this study, I examine a sub-tradition in the later history of the Kadizadeli movement, represented in Crimea and strongly connected with the Ottoman intellectual circles. The research provides an outline of the Kadizadeli scholarship in the region, including the legacy of Muḥammad al-Kafawī (d. 1754), Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī (d. 1761), and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qirīmī (d. ca. 1800). It is argued that their claim for the restoration of the "true Sunnah" included the reinterpretation of the traditional Sunni theology and ethics.

Keywords: Post-Classical Islam, Kadizadelism, Crimea, Reform in Islam, Post-Avicennian theology, Doctrine of monotheism, Free will.

Bibliography

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *'Iqd al-Qalā'id fī Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id,* Princeton University Library. Robert Garrett Collection. No. 4214 Y.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *Risālah fī al-bismillah*, Princeton University Library. Robert Garrett Collection. No. 832.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *Sharḥ aḥādīth al-'Arba'īn*, Istanbul: Aqdām Maṭba'ī, 1905.

Al-Ḥanbalī, Ibn Rajab: *Kashf al-Kurbah fi Waṣf Ḥāl Ahl al-Gurba*, in *Majmū' Rasā'īl ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī*, ed. by A. Al-Ḥalawānī, Cairo: Dār al-Fārūq al-Ḥāditha, 2003. pp. 315-332.

Al-Kafawī, Muḥammad: *Ḥāshiyah 'alā al-Lārī*, Istanbul: Maṭba'a Sulṭāna, 1867.

Al-Kafawī, Muḥammad: *Ḥāshiyah 'alā sharḥ Adab al-Baḥth*. Vernads'ky National Library of Ukraine. Manuscripts division. 74 No. 49.

Al-Kafawī, Muḥammad: *Risālah fī Ithbāt al-Wājib*, Princeton University Library. Robert Garrett Collection. No. ELS 3409.

Al-Kafawī, Muḥammad: *Sharḥ kalimāt lāgaziyah li-l-Birkawī*, Princeton University Library. Robert Garrett Collection, 4212Y.

Al-Khādimī, Abu Sa'īd: *Al-Barīqah Sharḥ al-Ṭarīqah*, Istanbul: Hakikat Kitabevi, 2011.

Al-Lāmishī, Abu al-Thāna': *Al-Tamhīd ila Qawā'īd al-Tawḥid*, ed. by A. Turkī, Beirut: Dār al-Garb al-Islāmī, 1995.

Al-Maḥbūbī, Ubaid Allah: *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥ 'alā al-Tawḍīḥ li-matni al-Tanqīḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, ed. by Zakariyah 'Amirat, Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1416/1996.

Al-Nāblusi, ʻAbd al-Gānī: *Al-Hadīqah al-Nadiyah*, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʻIlmiyah, 2011.

Al-Qirīmī, Quṭb al-Dīn: *Rāḥah al-Ummah fī Dār al-Mū'minah.* Milli Kütüphane (Ankara). No. 3577/1. F. 1a-13b.

Al-Rūmī, Aḥmad: *Majālis al-Abrār wa Masālik al-Akhyār wa Maḥaīq al-Bida'ah wa Maqāmi' al-Ashrār,* Madinah: Jāmi'ah al-Islāmiyah, 2007.

Al-Rūmī: Aḥmad: *Majālis al-Abrār wa Masālik al-Akhyār wa Maḥaīq al-Bida'ah wa Maqāmi' al-Ashrār*. Lviv Museum of the History of Religion. No. 6494. 302 ff.

Al-San'ānī, Muḥammad: *Taṭhīr al-ʻIttiqād ʻan Adrān al-Ilḥad*. Ed. by Naṣir bin Hasan, Makkah: Al-Waḥīd, 1425/2009.

Al-Sindī, Muhammad: *Al-Ifāḍatu al-Madaniyah fī al-Irādah al-Juz'iyyah*, Riyad: Maktabah al-Rushd, 2002.

Ibn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb, Muḥammad: "Al-Jāmi' li-'Ibādah Allahu Waḥdahu," *Silsilah Sharḥ al-Rasa'il* (Cairo: Dār al-Furqān, 1424/2008), pp. 245-279.

Brodersen, Angelika: "Göttliches und menschliches Handeln im māturīditischen kalām", *Jahrbuch für Islamische Theologie und Religionspädagogik*, 2 (2013), pp. 117-139.

Bruckmayr, Philipp: "The Particular Will (*al-irādat al-juz'iyya*): Excavations Regarding a Latecomer in Kalām Terminology on Human Agency and its Position in Naqshbandi Discourse", *European Journal of Turkish Studies,* 13 (2011), pp. 2-19.

Bursalı, Mehmed Tahir: *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, İstanbul: Meral Yayınevi, 1975.

Curry, John: "Kadizadeli Ottoman Scholarship, Muḥammad ibn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb, and the Rise of the Saudi State", *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 26/3 (2015), pp. 265-288.

Curry, John: *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire: The Rise of the Halveti Order, 1350-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

Dağ, Neslihan: "Muhammed B. Mustafa Akkirmani'nin İklilü't-Teracim adlı eserinde felsefi kavramlar" (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Elazığ: Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2006.

Dalkıran, Sayın: "Akkirmânî'nin İrâde-i Cüziyye ile İlgili Risâlesi ve Değerlendirmesi", *EKEV Akademi Dergisi - Sosyal Bilimler*, 2 (1998), pp. 173-180.

Evstatiev, Simeon: Qāḍīzādeli Movement and the Revival of Takfīr in the Ottoman Age, *Accusations of Unbelief in Islam A Diachronic Perspective on Takfīr*, ed. by Camilla Adang, Hassan Ansari, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke, Leiden: Brill, 2016, pp. 213-244.

Filan, Kerima: "Religious Puritans in Sarajevo in the 18th Century", *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi,* 33 (2013), pp. 43-62.

Heern, Zackery: *The Emergence of Modern Shi'ism: Islamic Reform in Iraq and Iran*, London: Oneworld Publications, 2015.

Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara: "Crimean Tatar and Nogay Scholars of the 18th Century", *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, ed. by. Kemper, M.; von Kügelgen, A.; Yermakov, D., Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1996, p. 279-296.

Muminov, Ashirbek: "Manuscripts of "Kata'ib A'lam al-Akhyar": New Materials for the Biography and Activity of Mahmud ibn Sulayman al-Kafawi", *Written Monuments of the Orient*, 2/19 (2013), pp. 159-177.

Pehlivan, Necmettin: "Muhammed Kefevî ve "Risâle fî'l- Âdâbı", *Felsefe Dünyası*, 56 (2012), p. 322-333.

Pessagno, Mertic J: Irāda, "Ikhtiyār, Qudra, Kasb the View of Abū Manṣur al-Māturīdī", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 104 (1984), p. 177-191.

Sariyannis, Marinos: "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a 'Mercantile Ethic'?", *Political Initiatives "From the Bottom Up" in the Ottoman Empire*, Rhetymmo: Crete University Press, 2012, pp. 263-291.

Schubert, Gudrun: "Ahmad b. Abdallah al-Qrimi, ein Verteidiger Ibn al-Arabis gegen die Orthodoxie", *Asiatische Studien*, 48 (1994), pp. 1379-1381.

The Qur'an. Translated by Sahih International Team, Birmingham: Maktabah Booksellers and Publishers, 2010.

Toksöz, Hatice: "Muhammed Akkirmânî'nin Ta'rîfâtü'l-fünûn ve menâkıbü'l-musannifîn Adlı Eserinde Felsefî İlimler Algısı", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 42 (2013), p. 177-205.

Zilfi, Madeline: "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century İstanbul", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 45/4, (1986), pp. 251-269.